

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X

MOHAMED JOHN AKHTAR AND LA BUCA
RESTAURANT, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

23-CV-06585 (JGLC) (VF)

-against-

ORDER

ROHIT AGGARWALA et al.,

Defendants.

-----X

VALERIE FIGUEREDO, United States Magistrate Judge:

On March 23, 2025, Defendant Eric M. Eisenberg filed an objection to the order at ECF No. 141, which authorized Plaintiffs to serve Defendant by e-mail. See ECF Nos. 141, 160. Defendant is advised that “merely filing an objection to [a Magistrate Judge’s] order does not excuse a party from complying with it.” Thai Lao Lignite (Thailand) Co. v. Gov’t of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, No. 10-CV-5256 (KMW), 2011 WL 4111504, at *9 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 13, 2011); see also Litton Indus., Inc. v. Lehman Bros. Kuhn Loeb Inc., 124 F.R.D. 75, 79 (S.D.N.Y. 1989) (holding that objections to a Magistrate Judge’s order do not obviate the objecting party’s obligation to comply with the order); Michelo v. Nat’l Collegiate Student Loan Tr. 2007-2, No. 18-CV-1781 (PGG) (BCM), 2021 WL 1080673, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 5, 2021) (“[T]he law in the Second Circuit is clear: the filing of Rule 72(a) objections to a magistrate judge’s . . . order does not excuse a party from complying with that order”).

As such, Defendant must still respond to the amended complaint, notwithstanding Defendant's pending objection to the Court's order. Defendant's deadline to respond to Plaintiffs' amended complaint is **Wednesday, April 9, 2025**. That is 21 days from the date of service on March 19, 2025 (see ECF No. 147). See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: New York, New York
March 25, 2025



VALERIE FIGUEREDO
United States Magistrate Judge